

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

NOVEMBER 12, 2015

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 12th day of November, 2015. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Sandy Bahan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. She welcomed Dawn Jourdan to the Planning Commission.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Sherrer
Roberta Pailes
Erin Williford
Tom Knotts
Sandy Bahan
Dawn Jourdan
Dave Boeck
Chris Lewis
Cindy Gordon

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

CONSENT DOCKET

Chair Bahan announced that the Consent Docket consisted of the following items:

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2015 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 4, being:

PP-1516-9 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY C.A. MCCARTY CONSTRUCTION, L.L.C. (CRAFTON TULL) FOR WOODCREST ESTATES PLAZA ADDITION FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.82 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF PORTER AVENUE AND ROCK CREEK ROAD.

* * *

Chair Bahan asked if any member of the Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked whether any member of the audience wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked for discussion by the Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chris Lewis moved to approve the Consent Docket as presented. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailles, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Consent Docket as presented, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2015 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

The minutes were approved as presented on the Consent Docket by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

PP-1516-9 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY C.A. MCCARTY CONSTRUCTION, L.L.C. (CRAFTON TULL) FOR WOODCREST ESTATES PLAZA ADDITION FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.82 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF PORTER AVENUE AND ROCK CREEK ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Concept Site Plan
6. Request for Alley Waiver
7. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Commission Comments

The Preliminary Plat for WOODCREST ESTATES PLAZA ADDITION was recommended for approval by the City Council on the Consent Docket by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

O-1415-43 – MICHAEL MILLER REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A TYPE I BED AND BREAKFAST ESTABLISHMENT FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 2107 WESTWOOD DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Request for Postponement
4. Excerpt of October 8, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chair Bahan announced that this item has been withdrawn by the applicant.

* * *

Item No. 6a, being:

R-1516-26 – FULTON WORSTER GROUP, ON BEHALF OF NANCY GUERRA AND DON HATCHER, REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN, FROM OFFICE DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND BROOKS STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 6b, being:

O-1516-20 – FULTON WORSTER GROUP, ON BEHALF OF NANCY GUERRA AND DON HATCHER, REQUESTS REZONING FROM RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND BROOKS STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 6c, being:

PP-1516-11 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY NANCY GUERRA AND DON HATCHER (PRIORITY LAND SURVEYING, L.L.C.) FOR HATCHER ADDITION FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.62 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND BROOKS STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Request for Alley Waiver
7. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – This application has three parts to it: the 2025 land use amendment, as well as a plat and rezoning. The existing land use in this area consists of office to the north and east of this subject tract. We have high density residential to the south, commercial and high density residential to the southwest, and additional high density residential and office across the street on 24th Avenue. The land use change would bring this site into the commercial designation if approved. The existing zoning on this site is RM-6. We have RM-6 as well as C-2 to the north of this site. We have RM-2 to the east, RM-6 to the south, with additional C-1 and RM-6 to the west across 24th Avenue. The existing land uses in this area consist of office, some higher density residential to the east of this tract, and higher density residential to the south. There is an institutional use at the southwest corner of 24th and Brooks, with additional apartments to the west. This is an aerial of the site itself. As you can see, the single family home is still in place. There is a larger area to the north of that site. This is the existing home and that's a picture of the area to the north of the home. All of that will be included in the preliminary plat. This is looking north on 24th Avenue. There are some office uses in this area, and that does carry the C-2 zoning as well. This is the office use that is directly north of this subject tract. Looking south on 24th, you can see there is retail commercial. The institutional use is right here at this corner. The apartments to the south across Brooks, and the apartments across 24th on the west side. These are the combination duplex and triplex use to the east of this site; they do access off Brooks. This is the preliminary plat for Hatcher Addition that will consist of two lots. This is the proposed site plan for that area. Again, this is just a proposed site plan; the new owners could come in and take up the entire area, or they could buy one of the lots. As stated, this area has been built out

since the 70s, or possibly early 80s. These uses are definitely more intense than the existing single family use that was there on this site. Staff believes that this is a good in-fill product for this hard corner at Brooks and 24th, and we do support this request and we recommend approval of Preliminary Plat PP-1516-11, the resolution R-1516-26, as well as the ordinance O-1516-20. I am available for any questions you might have. The applicant's representative is here for a presentation.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Brad Worster, representing the applicant, 132 North Santa Fe – Staff's presentation had a lot of the same things I did, so I'm going to go through these pretty quickly and then speak a little bit more toward the actual design of the site toward the end. It is on the northeast corner of Brooks and 24th Street and primarily undeveloped. The house itself probably takes up maybe a third or a fifth of the lot and the rest of it has some ancillary buildings or has never been constructed on. The house itself was built in 1955, which was actually prior to this area of town even being annexed into Norman. Norman was annexed on this, I believe, in 1960. So that's where the zoning sort of started, because they said there's a house on the property, we'll call it R-1 in 1960. I thought it was a little interesting to compare these two side-by-side to see how such a big swath of this has all been zoned RM-6, just like the subject property, but the intended uses was never really to be that intense for multi-family zoning. Then I have some of the same sort of pictures here, walking south on 24th Avenue. That's Westpark Drive – office uses, commercial buildings. There is a nursing home/assisted living facility on the west side of the road. This was an infill medical office use. That's directly to the west of the property, and south. The property has been listed for sale for the last several years and has not been able to be sold as a single parcel zoned multi-family with a land use of office, so we've looked at splitting that into two potential separate lots but connecting them with a cross-access easement so that there would only be one entrance on 24th Avenue and one on Brooks Street. That's the site plan again. I thought it would be a little more helpful if you could see how that site plan lays out on top of the aerial, so you can kind of see the scope. On the east side and the north side, we've designed in a large landscape buffer. There's a utility easement and then the drives themselves also buffer the property from the actual structures and the parking areas. That outlines where the cross access drive would be. Utility vehicles and service vehicles would use that to get to both proposed lots. And that's a quick presentation from the applicant. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

2. Ms. Pailles – The detention pond – is that sloped grassy type of construction?

Mr. Worster – Yes. All of the drainage currently goes from the intersection and then it actually flows to the northeast. We've just let it keep flowing in that direction, then used the detention pond as a buffer again toward the multi-family use there, and it will slowly drain out from the detention pond. It's not a concrete structure. It will just be all grassy berm.

3. Mr. Knotts – Are you dependent on percolation for drainage – I don't see a connection.

Mr. Worster – The preliminary drainage study did allow it to more or less percolate out. It does drain to the north. We based that study on just about as much pervious surface as you can see there. We added a lot more parking than what would be needed for a total of 6,000 feet and it does appear that the engineers have that set up where it will be able to work from that direction.

Mr. Knotts – I don't see any data that says what kind of perc rate it has. This looks like a mess in the back of where these duplexes on the east side are going to have to smell what – for a period of time. Because once you dig this out, I don't think you're going to get to sand. I think you need to think of some kind of structured drainage for this pond.

Mr. Worster – This entire area is a bit of a challenge. I think there is a total of two feet of slope across this whole site, to the street. And it really goes that way in all directions. It doesn't really slope until you get on the other side of 24th Street. So it's a very flat area of town. There is enough room, if the site is built up a little bit, to be able to move water out. We looked at a

worst case scenario as far as from the engineering figures. Again, I'm not the engineer. But I trust that his calculations have all been correct. Will it end up with that much parking area? It's possible; that's why we've showed it. But it could have almost half of that less, which would allow for really plenty of space to have that work. Again, this is a preliminary plat. If we move forward with a final plat and a specific building plan, then we could either bring in an additional detention easement or drainage easement along the north edge of the property and get it to 24th Street. We just require storm sewers.

4. Mr. Boeck – Just for clarification, has a civil engineer been involved in the preliminary?

Mr. Worster – Yes. Absolutely. They've done all of the engineering.

Mr. Danner – Yes, we've had a drainage report submitted and it has been reviewed by the professional engineers – City engineer and development engineer. It is going to be a challenge regarding the detention and how it is released. It may have to be moved further to the south to sheet flow release to the north where it's currently going. So those are typically with final designs.

5. Mr. Knotts – I would just say that this looks like a problem, and the problem could be impacting people off-site. So I think that's something that really needs to be reviewed.

Mr. Danner – And that's one of the things they're looking at, is because they don't want to impact the property owner to the north.

6. Ms. Jourdan – I'd like to address the adequacy of the buffer next to the multi-family housing. I see a greenscape presented there. Is there fencing as well?

Mr. Worster – I believe there's going to be fencing required for any commercial zoning to a residential use, so there would be a site-proof fence that would be installed prior to any other construction.

Ms. Jourdan – Can you tell me a little bit about the road that passes through the site – anticipated flow and so forth?

Mr. Worster – We haven't really designed this to be a giant shopping center. We've looked at this total site, I think, as under 6,000 square feet of total floor space, which is less than 100 vehicles a day, with I think 80-ish on any given peak hour. Anybody turning, even on peak traffic hours -- we specifically set it up so that anybody leaving either parcel 1 or 2 could come back through to Brooks and make a left-hand turn at the light which is a signaled turn lane, and wouldn't have to try to be turning across four lanes of traffic. The way it's designed will hopefully deter anybody from trying to use it as a shortcut to get around the light, because it makes them make six turns instead of one, which would also keep traffic from zipping across the development. Does that answer your question? Okay.

7. Ms. Pailes – The type of business that will be here is unspecified. Is that correct?

Mr. Worster – We don't have a user planned at this time, no.

Ms. Pailes – How can you anticipate traffic demand not knowing what kind of business is there?

Mr. Worster – Well, that's a very good question. It will ultimately come down to when they do a building permit, if their traffic count is higher or if the use is higher, then they'll have to go back and come back through and redo a whole traffic study and see if that's going to work or not. That would be caught at the actual physical development stage.

8. Ms. Williford – Have you considered the traffic that happens at about 8:30 and 3:30 every day with Whittier getting out, because it's kind of a mess right now and I have concerns, even with the cutout, about all the students that are walking and the backup on both of those turn lanes, going right out of Brooks, turning right onto Brooks, left – all of those.

Mr. Worster – I'll let the traffic engineer talk.

Mr. Riesland – The first thing that you look at with any development is how many peak hour trips is it going to generate? This is going to generate less than 100 during the peak hour, so

a traffic study is not required because of that. Commercial developments don't tend to have their peaks at that same time that you're talking about, so we don't view that really as creating any more out there than what there is now.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1516-26, Ordinance No. O-1516-20, and PP-1516-11, the Preliminary Plat for HATCHER ADDITION, with an alley waiver, to the City Council. Roberta Pailes seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS

NAYES

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan,
Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
Erin Williford

None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1516-26, Ordinance No. O-1516-20, and PP-1516-11 with an alley waiver, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-1.

* * *

Item No. 7a, being:

O-1516-17 – GOLDEN TWINS, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PUD ESTABLISHED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-1314-56 TO AMEND THE SITE PLAN AND PUD NARRATIVE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1305 TRIAD VILLAGE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Excerpt of October 8, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

and

Item No. 7b, being:

O-1516-19 – GOLDEN TWINS, L.L.C. REQUESTS VACATION AND CLOSURE OF THE 25' PLATTED BUILDING LINE ALONG TRIAD VILLAGE DRIVE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1305 TRIAD VILLAGE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Request for Postponement
4. Excerpt of Minutes of October 8, 2015 Planning Commission

Dave Boeck asked to be recused for these items.

Andy Sherrer moved to allow Mr. Boeck's recusal on these items. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailles, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to allow Mr. Boeck's recusal on this item passed by a vote of 8-0.

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – Several of you saw this application in June of 2014 when we brought this forward for a rezoning to place this tract under the PUD zoning. They were planning for a senior housing development. You recommended approval for a zoning change to allow this to go to a Planned Unit Development. Council subsequently approved that in August of 2014. What you're seeing tonight is an amendment to the site plan, as well as the PUD, and they're also requesting vacation and closure of the platted 25' build line. The site was actually designed for a 5' build line, but we did not realize that when it came through. The existing zoning is already in place, so we will not be changing the PUD itself. And, of course, the existing land use is still the same. You have the high density residential to the east, south, and you have the commercial to the west, with the mini-storage facility to the north. I'll just run through a couple of these pictures for you. This is the site itself, with the mini-storage in the distance. This is Triad looking north. This is the senior housing that's across the street. Apartments. Additional apartments to the south. That is Thunderbird Clubhouse in the distance. This is the final plat showing the 25' build line. In your agenda, you actually saw the site plan showing where they are proposing the new location of the buildings at the 5' setback. They have requested to vacate that 25' setback. They have added a sign package to this application, so that will be an amendment in the PUD because pulling these buildings up to 5', obviously, the signage requirement is to have it at 25' so that's not going to work for them, either. Staff does support this request and we do recommend

approval of Ordinance No. O-1516-19 and Ordinance No. O-1516-17. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have. The applicant's representative is here with a brief presentation for you, as well.

2. Ms. Pailes – It mentions that the internal sidewalks are 4' wide and this is an aging in place facility. A walker is 2' wide. How are two walkers supposed to pass on the sidewalk? One of them is going to end up in ditch.

Ms. Hudson – I think I'll let his representative answer that question.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, 136 Thompson Drive, representing the applicant – I'm not sure that we have an answer for you. I would defer to our aging in place specialist, Dave Boeck, who just left the room and we don't want to call back. But he designed this, so I think it will be fine. We've created many places for patios and interaction. I don't have an answer for you.

2. Ms. Pailes – It just doesn't add up, and especially if somebody is in a wheelchair. You can't get two people past each other on a 4' sidewalk.

Mr. Rieger – I will share that with Commissioner Boeck.

Ms. Pailes – And especially if a wheelchair is being pushed by an older spouse. You really can't just pull off on the side.

Mr. Rieger – I know Commissioner Boeck, your colleague – this is his speciality. This project has really been a passion of his. He has designed it from the outset. He's been a stalwart to keep a community building presence in it and he's worked very hard on a lot of aspects of this project. So I will ask him about that. I don't know the answer off-hand to your question, though.

3. Ms. Pailes – You mentioned there's going to be the standard polycart. That's really difficult for older people to drag those about.

Mr. Rieger – We talked quite a bit about that. I think there will be some form of a person or an agreement on site of one person will be responsible for that. The applicant, and again, Dave Boeck, we've talked about it. I think you're right and there will be some help needed for that. But we're committed to doing that. Probably designate one person on site to be responsible for helping that, and probably somewhat of a manager position that takes care of things like that.

4. Ms. Pailes – I know the curve was a bit of a problem. Streets have to be a certain distance from the curve to allow for a good sight distance. There's the curve to the south there, but there's also a curve to the north, where it bends around heading toward the storage units. It doesn't show on there, but up north of it there's another curve.

Mr. Rieger – Off site you're talking about?

Ms. Pailes – Yes. So when you pull out of that street to the north, you're very close to that curve. I might be overly fond of the ruler function of Google Earth, but it looks like it's only about 160', rather than the 280' sight distance that is said to be appropriate. It looks very close.

Mr. Rieger – I will tell you the reason we're back here tonight is the curve and the setback. We worked extensively with Mr. Lombardo and traffic and David in the back – Angelo is not here tonight – but we worked extensively with them to come up with a design that would work for this site. All along there were curb cuts planned, I believe, at these locations. What we're changing is the front setback so we can see across our site.

Ms. Pailes – I see where the difference is and that works with the southern curve. It looked like the northern curve was a little closer than your 280'.

Mr. Rieger – We have full blessing from staff after looking at this extensively. And it was really the focus of our coming back. Because what happened, and Ms. Hudson described it to you, but we got into building permitting actually and they saw the plat and staff was just not comfortable with letting us have a building permit as being over that 25' setback shown on the plat, so we agreed to come back and correct that. The site plan was changed quite a bit to do

that. What we used to have was buildings, if you look on the screen here, much closer to the street and the modifications were to pull this. And then also one way. So this is a one-way entry coming in this way and out. Quite a lot of modifications to deal with all of the sight line issues.

Ms. Pailes – I use this street quite a bit because it connects Homeland to Subway, and that curve is kind of a deal. It looked a little close and I just wanted someone to tell me, yes, that street had been measured and was probably 280' from the northern curve.

Mr. Rieger – It was the big focus of this whole project. We have spent a significant amount of time with Mr. Lombardo and Mr. Danner is here tonight. We spent a lot of time with Public Works in general on this.

Ms. Pailes – And the speed limit is 25?

Mr. Rieger – I believe that's right. The posted speed limit. Yes.

Ms. Gordon – Roberta, it does say in here that the buildings have been set back far enough to match the 280' in both directions. It specifically says it in here.

Ms. Pailes – Yes. When I measured it, I didn't come out with that, but that's possibly me.

5. Mr. Rieger – I really would just answer questions. You're really being asked to simply approve a modified site plan and the vacation of the 25' setback. That's essentially it. Otherwise, it's basically the same. There's no change in density or use or anything else as was proposed previously as it was in front of you. So I'm happy to answer any other questions. We ask for your approval tonight.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Lewis – I do have a question for staff. Does the City of Norman have a standard for the width of a sidewalk, and certainly as much influx of federal monies as we have, I would think that that standard would already meet the Americans with Disabilities Act? Does anyone know?

Mr. Danner – We have standards for the public right-of-way, but I don't know of a standard on private property.

Ms. Pailes – The sidewalk along Triad Village is wide enough. The internal sidewalks are not.

Mr. Lewis – Right. I understand that. But a sidewalk – we don't just decide is it going to be 1' wide, 2' wide, 3' wide. Usually there's a standard for almost everything.

Mr. Danner – Most common on interior is 4'.

Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-17 and Ordinance No. O-1516-19 to the City Council. Erin Williford seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS

Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,
Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon

NAYES

None

RECUSED

Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-17 and Ordinance No. O-1516-19 to City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 8a, being:

O-1516-21 – CHICKASAW NATION INDUSTRIES, INC. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ESTABLISHED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-0607-35 FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE TERMINUS OF JOHN SAXON BOULEVARD.

Item No. 8b, being:

PP-1516-13 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY CHICKASAW NATION INDUSTRIES, INC. (LEMKE LAND SURVEYING, L.L.C.) FOR CORPORATE ADDITION 1 FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE TERMINUS OF JOHN SAXON BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Request for Postponement

Chair Bahan announced that the applicant has requested that these items be postponed to the December 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chris Lewis moved to postpone Ordinance No. O-1415-21 and PP-1516-13, the Preliminary Plat for CORPORATE ADDITION 1, to the December 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS

Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailles, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts,
Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis,
Cindy Gordon

NAYES

None

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Ordinance No. O-1516-21 and PP-1516-13, the Preliminary Plat for CORPORATE ADDITION 1, to the December 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

O-1516-22 – CASL HOLDINGS, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM RO, RESIDENCE-OFFICE DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.92 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 542 S. UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Pre-Development Summary

Chair Bahan announced that the applicant has requested postponement of this item to the December 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chris Lewis moved to postpone Ordinance No. O-1516-22 to the December 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. Andy Sherrer seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Ordinance No. O-1516-22 to the December 10, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 10a, being:

R-1516-27 – RED ROCK LAND FUND, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION FOR APPROXIMATELY 5.51 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH AND WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF 12TH AVENUE N.E. AND TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 10b, being:

O-1516-23 -- RED ROCK LAND FUND, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ESTABLISHED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-0708-40 TO AMEND THE USES ALLOWED IN SPECIFIC AREAS.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Exhibit E

Item No. 10c, being:

PP-1516-12 – CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY SWEETGRASS COMMUNITIES, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR RED CANYON RANCH ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR APPROXIMATELY 61.675 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF 12TH AVENUE N.E. AND TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Request for Alley Waiver for Commercial Area
7. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee – This is a request for a NORMAN 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan amendment from commercial to low density residential at the northwest corner of 12th Avenue N.E. and Tecumseh Road. This is the existing land use; it is designated as commercial. This is the subject tract that they are requesting to go from commercial to low density residential. They are also asking for amendment of the PUD, Ordinance No. O-0708-40, and consideration of a revised preliminary plat for Red Canyon Ranch Addition. This is the subject tract. The underlying PUD will continue to remain. The only change is removing 5.5 approximate acres from commercial to residential. Right now it is vacant. This is the first phase of Red Canyon Ranch that is being built out currently. Preliminary plat will be this whole subject tract. As I stated, the underlying PUD will remain. The only change is removing the commercial designation to residential. This is an aerial overview. This is to give you an idea of where we are. Tecumseh. 12th Avenue N.E. Commercial corners here and here, as well as here. This reduces the commercial development by 5.5 acres and puts it into residential zone. This is at the corner of Tecumseh and 12th looking to the north. This will be the site where the commercial development will take place. Looking back to the west off of 12th. Here you can see the rooftops on the first phase of Red Canyon Ranch. This is looking back to the south. Southwest. Again looking north on 12th. This will be residential. This is looking south on 12th. This is the intersection of 12th and Tecumseh. Again, this will be the site of the commercial development. Looking west on Tecumseh. Looking to the south. This is the preliminary plat for Red Canyon Ranch. This is a difficult slide to see, but this is the only change

right here and it is Exhibit E to the PUD, which removes the commercial designation to residential. That is the only change for this proposal is the 5.5 acres from commercial designation to residential. It is shown as Exhibit E. Staff does support and recommends approval of R-1516-27, Ordinance O-1516-23, and the preliminary plat PP-1516-12. I would be happy to answer any questions.

2. Ms. Gordon – I have a quick question. Commercial can't develop until there are a certain number of rooftops in the area? Is that right? When do they know that there are enough rooftops?

Ms. Greenlee – When they start getting people to look at that commercial land. It's already designated as commercial. So when they have buyers that come in and start looking at it.

Ms. Gordon – So it's kind of arbitrary. It's when a buyer comes in and says now we've got enough to support.

Ms. Greenlee – It is. Now we have enough to support. Correct.

3. Ms. Pailes – There was one letter of protest. Would you like to address the concern about the street there?

Ms. Greenlee – This was preliminary platted. This went through final plat. This section did not get final platted and the preliminary plat expired. The roads and layout had already been done in that final plat. The protest, I believe, came from someone up here out of the radius area for it to count, but it is a protest letter concerned about commercial development and the roads. The commercial development will only be in this section here. This is all going to be residential.

Mr. Boeck – And that was already platted?

Ms. Greenlee – Yes. This is already final platted. The preliminary plat expired. Initially, just a little background, there was going to be a church and a private school that was going to be located when this whole thing came through, and not any more. So they're reducing the amount of commercial.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, SMC Consulting Engineers, representing the applicant – If I can get that drawing back. This 61 acres that's essentially on the east side of this pipeline. This is the west perimeter of our plat is that line right there. All of this on the west side has been final platted and houses built there. So the reason we're downzoning, if you want to say, 5.5 acres is because, after many years, we've had two good commercial bites that didn't take the apple. One was a church that we thought was going to happen; it didn't happen. The other was a girls' school that's coming down from Edmond, and that didn't happen. So the land is now needing to have another access from Sooner Road and so the developer who is building the development – it's going very well – has requested let's just take away some of the commercial and add some more single family homes. That is the substance of this application. And that weird area that she just showed you a while ago – that's the diagram of the change. You see that funny little line right there? That's the northern line of our change and come right there. That's the 5.5 acres that we're taking out. The road geometry that we had on the preliminary plat is the same. We have added this connection right there and that's adding those lots. That is the change. So the developer is wanting to take away 5.5 acres and add 5.5 acres of single family lots. There is nothing right now scheduled in the commercial corner. But that residual amount is left for that area. We did have some people show up at the Pre-Development meeting asking us are we going to put a gas station there. The answer is no, we can't. A gas station takes a special permission and we're not asking for that. So there's nothing right now on the corner, except we had to illustrate a site plan to meet Sub Regs. Other than that, it's the same thing you've seen before with this 5.5 acre change. So if there are any more questions, I'll try to respond.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1516-27, Ordinance No. O-1516-23, and PP-1516-12, the Preliminary Plat for RED CANYON RANCH ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development, with an alley waiver for the commercial property, to the City Council.

1. Ms. Greenlee – The underlying PUD allows for a mixed building or a gas station. It is already in that underlying PUD. I just wanted to make that clear. That had come up at Pre-Development and we did not have the PUD file pulled, and I was unable to answer that question. But after hearing that discussion, I just want to make sure that that is known that it is allowed in the underlying PUD.

2. Ms. Jourdan – Are there any proximity issues with a potential gas station and the residential in that spot if a change is made?

Ms. Greenlee – It's an allowed use. As far as the residential against commercial, it's just seen the same way as far as the use goes.

Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailles, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1516-27, Ordinance No. O-1516-23, and PP-1516-12 with an alley waiver for the commercial area, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 11, being:

O-1516-24 – UTC II, L.L.C. AND UNIVERSITY TOWN CENTER, L.L.C. REQUEST AMENDMENT OF THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ESTABLISHED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-0607-13 TO AMEND THE USES ALLOWED IN SPECIFIC AREAS BY ADDING: 1) BAR, LOUNGE OR TAVERN; 2) LIVE ENTERTAINMENT VENUE; AND 3) MIXED BUILDINGS.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Amended and Restated PUD Narrative
4. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee – As you stated, this is an amendment to the underlying PUD, Ordinance No. O-0607-13, amending the uses allowed in only specific areas. The three uses that they want to add to the existing C-2 uses are a bar, lounge or tavern, live entertainment venue, and mixed buildings. This is in specific areas, and as we go through I will show you that. Subject tract – this is where they are only going to allow these three amendments to the PUD – this tract here and the tract on the west side of 24th. Currently both tracts are vacant. Again, an aerial to give you a little bit of perspective. This is the tract here and this one here. You have Crest here, the airport, and this is Embassy Suites, Academy and the shopping centers, of course. This is the site itself looking back to the south. To the north. And to the west. And the one tract is over here. This is Legacy Park. Again, Legacy Park. So it would be directly coming in, aligning with Legacy Park. This is looking to the east. These uses would only be allowed in these two subject tracts. It's labeled as Exhibit H to the PUD amendment and this would be the only place that these three uses would be allowed. Staff does support and recommends approval of O-1516-24. Be happy to answer any questions.

2. Mr. Knotts – Could you go back to the aerial? So the drawing that's in the book doesn't reflect the reality that's in the aerial.

Ms. Greenlee – I'm sorry. There are two tracts here that are hotels that are not included in that. Is that what you're talking about?

Mr. Knotts – I know that. I'm talking about the Legacy Park Drive right there. That's not on this map.

Ms. Greenlee – The location map. It is not. It was not platted. My understanding, from talking to Engineering, this is a drive that was platted like that. This drive is shown here. You're saying it's not shown on the location map or the exhibit.

Mr. Knotts – Yeah. So I'm wondering exactly where that non-existent drive that's really there is in reference to this subject tract.

Ms. Greenlee – The drive from where I took pictures – that is there.

Mr. Knotts – So it's right in the middle of that?

Ms. Greenlee – And this is the area of the proposed lifestyle area that they were proposing for these tracts.

Mr. Knotts – Seems odd to me.

Ms. Greenlee – That the road is not shown on the location?

Mr. Knotts – Must be the engineer that made a mistake.

Mr. Boeck – Would only be caught by a landscape architect, Tom.

Mr. Knotts – Or anyone that happened to drive out there and wonder where is this road?

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, representing the applicant – She had another drawing. This tract of land, if you've driven out there, is under construction. In that building we have a joint tenant. One is called World of Beer and it is right by Torchy Taco, and that's where this issue came up. Because the definition of sales has to do with how much sales is food and how much is not food. So this is where this came from. There is the road right there, Tom – can't you see it? It's right there. It's pretty clear. The other tract of land is this tract of land that we've added to the amendment

because we're not sure – that's going to be a player to be named later, and we think that might have some issue that will have the same thing there. So that's why this amendment only applies to these two tracts of land only. You're right, Tom; that road is not shown there. You're correct.

2. Mr. Knotts – What came to mind when I was out there is that I thought that that was where this road came through, but that actually puts kind of a removed piece in this area that is along 24th Avenue on the east side, up to Legacy Park – it's separated. And, of course, if you put drives through there, the pieces are going to be separated.

Mr. McCaleb – And that's still the plan to bring them through; it comes in like this and goes down toward Crest. That's there. So it's not shown but it is there. It's not a public road – it's a driveway. It's not a public road.

Mr. Knotts – I thought if you've got it signalized, which you do have on 24th, that that muddled that water.

Mr. McCaleb – It's a little bit muddy. But that is the geometry where it is and that's been programmed, planned and shown for quite a while. But this whole acceptance of what we're doing now has nothing to do with that road. It's just getting this issue resolved so that when we come in and bring something in this tract that we don't go through this again. We have the issue right now. It may not be an issue, but they just don't want it to become an issue. They don't know how the food and beverage is going to work out on that.

Mr. Knotts – But aside from that food and beverage, are you planning at some point to plat that from Legacy Circle to the east of 24th?

Mr. McCaleb – Yes. Hasn't happened yet, but there's still things happening.

3. Ms. Pailles – Live entertainment – does that include adult entertainment?

Ms. Connors – No, it does not.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

*Dave Boeck moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-24, to the City Council.
Chris Lewis seconded the motion.*

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailles, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan, Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-24, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 12, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

None

* * *

Item No. 13, being:

ADJOURNMENT

Chris Lewis moved to adjourn. Roberta Pailles seconded the motion. There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.



Norman Planning Commission